

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-28 were previously and are currently pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-28 are rejected.

Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §§ 102 AND 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 1-3, 6-11, 14-19 and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Takebayashi. At pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 4, 12, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takebayashi as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Yokogawa. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Amended claim 1 recites that the progress of a dialogue is controlled based on the information storage state of the predetermined number of slots *without using any dialogue sequence definition*. See also claims 9, 17, and 25. For support, see at least Figures 13 and 14, which show that a dialogue sequence definition is not defined, used, or referenced during the progression of a dialogue.

The rejection compares claim 1 to Figure 4 of Takebayashi. Referring to Figure 9 in Takebayashi, it can be seen that Takebayashi *requires* management of the state of progress of the dialogue. In Takebayashi, the state transition represents the dialogue sequence definition, and the output of the dialogue is dependent on the managed state of the dialogue (see column 12, lines 50-55). In comparison, the amended response processor of claim 1, for example, does not use any dialogue sequence information to complete the dialogue. Rather, response information is output to the user in accordance with an information storage state of the slots to make the progress of the dialogue in order to store into the predetermined number of slots all of the information items that are required to achieve the particular objective of the dialogue.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 recites a knowledge base relating to said dialogue with said user and determining whether information stored in said knowledge base is necessary to be updated if all said information items required to achieve said aim of said one dialogue with said certain user are stored in all of said predetermined number of slots, and updating said knowledge base in accordance with a predetermined rule if it is determined that said information stored in said knowledge base is necessary to be updated.

According to claim 5, if all the information items required to achieve the aim of the dialogue are stored in all of the predetermined number of slots, then it is judged whether the information in the knowledge base needs to be updated. In other words, the condition of updating the knowledge base is, first, that all of the information items required for the aim of the dialogue are stored in all of the predetermined number of slots.

The rejection states that Figure 5 of Takebayashi is comparable to the knowledge base in claim 5. However, the teachings of Figure 5 of Takebayashi differ because in Figure 5's keyword list there is no discussion of what condition leads to an update of the keyword list.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 recites storing response information for said user in correspondence with said information storage state of said slots, and determining said information storage state of said slots and acquiring and outputting response information for said certain user in correspondence with said information storage state of said slots from said response information storage device.

The rejection compares claim 6 to Figure 1 of Takebayashi. However, in Takebayashi, there is no discussion or suggestion that response information for the user is in correspondence with the information storage state of the slots.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 3 recites checking whether there is inconsistency between information stored in said slots and information stored in said knowledge base by using said information stored in said slots and said information stored in said knowledge

base by using said information stored in said slots and said information stored in said knowledge base. This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: OCT 29, 2004

By: James T. Strom  
James T. Strom  
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

### CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 29 OCT, 2004

STAAS & HALSEY

By: J. Strom

Date: OCT 29, 2004